

ITEMS

VOLUME 7 • NUMBER 4 • DECEMBER 1953
230 PARK AVENUE • NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

AREA RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS AND TRAVEL GRANTS FOR AREA RESEARCH: AN EPILOGUE

by Joseph B. Casagrande and Elbridge Sibley

THE special program of area research training fellowships and travel grants which was launched by the Council early in 1948 has drawn to a close during the past year. In the six-year period the program was in operation, awards totaling about \$700,000 have enabled 214 individuals¹ to carry on research in virtually every accessible part of the world. While the history of the program is much too recent to appraise its success in perspective, it seems appropriate at this time to present a brief review of the Council's experience in administering these awards and to provide some pertinent facts concerning recipients of fellowships and grants.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROGRAM

World War II not only brought an urgent demand for even fragmentary information about the remote places that had become its battlegrounds, but also left with many Americans a sense of moral obligation to gain deeper understanding of peoples and cultures of which they had been scarcely conscious. Nor have these needs been less compellingly felt in the ensuing years of tension which have seen the rapid growth of far-flung programs of technical aid and mutual assistance. The concept of area studies antedates World War II by a decade or more, and courses on particular foreign countries had appeared sporadically in college and university curricula much earlier, but the exigencies of war and the postwar emotional and intellectual climate have given impetus and direction to the development of academic programs

and institutes for area studies. While preoccupation with matters of immediate strategic interest has led to the perpetuation of large-scale intelligence services within the civil and military arms of government, the universities with the support of private foundations have assumed responsibility for the establishment of a firm base for long-range scholarly research and training programs related to the major areas of the world.

Against this background the Council late in 1946 established the Committee on World Area Research to give attention to the role of social science in the development of research and training in this field. On the basis of that committee's first recommendations, the Council undertook to administer a program of fellowships and grants designed to further the training and research of scholars specializing on foreign areas, especially those areas that had been relatively neglected by American scholars in the past. The program was supported throughout its existence by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which at the same time expanded its aid to university centers for area studies.

The Committee on Area Research Training Fellowships was appointed in January 1948 to administer the new program, and the first fellowship was awarded in February. From the outset two types of awards were available: area research training fellowships and travel grants for area research. The former were offered at the predoctoral and postdoctoral levels "to meet the training needs of persons who are or propose to become specialists on the contemporary cultures of certain major world areas outside the United States." The latter were offered only to mature scholars already recognized as area specialists and were designed to cover the costs of

¹ This figure does not include awards made to a number of persons who for various reasons were unable to take them up. It does include two persons who have held both fellowships and travel grants.

travel to and in the areas of interest and other incidental research expenses.

SOME GENERAL POLICIES

GOVERNING THE PROGRAM

In administering the fellowships and grants the Council's single mandate to work for the advancement of scientific research remained the guiding principle. No award was knowingly made to anyone intending to spend his fellowship term in other than untrammelled scholarly activities. Thus, fellowships and grants were not available to philanthropically motivated individuals who wished to carry on ameliorative enterprises, or to staff members of governmental agencies wishing to make investigations that might be construed by the people of other nations as aimed at advancing immediate American national interests rather than at increasing objective knowledge.

The *Zeitgeist* of the postwar years, including those in which the area program was in operation, has been increasingly inhospitable to painstaking research. It has pressed for quick answers to questions of policy, and has countenanced short cuts for the sake of immediate gains. The committee administering the program nevertheless did not lose sight of its goal of contributing to the broader and deeper understanding of other cultures.

It was no easy task for the committee, in passing upon applications, to make the discrimination implied in the announced purpose of supporting studies relevant to "an understanding of contemporary culture." This was construed to admit historical research—41 of the 214 fellows and grantees have been professional historians or students trained primarily in history—but to exclude research of purely antiquarian interest. In the quest for deeper understanding, the subjects of study have not been confined to the realms of international relations and macroeconomics, but have ranged from anthropological studies of little known primitive peoples to the search for clues to social values in the literature and artistic products of civilizations older than our own. Many fellows have pursued research which although remote from the issues that fill today's headlines can be expected to contribute ultimately to a better understanding of their implications.

SELECTION OF FELLOWS AND GRANTEES

In the selection of recipients of fellowships and grants it was decided to follow the pattern of the Council's long-standing fellowship and grant-in-aid programs, under which individual applicants are judged by a central committee that endeavors to apply uniform standards to all. Although the fellowships and grants were thus

open in general competition to all who met the minimum requirements for application, it is nevertheless not surprising that a large proportion of the awards were made to faculty members and students in the small number of leading centers of area study.

It was hoped that the fellowships would serve to attract to area studies persons of demonstrated competence for productive research in social science or closely related fields. With this goal in mind, applications were invited from postdoctoral candidates who had no previous knowledge of or research experience in the area to be studied, and the normal upper age limit for postdoctoral applicants was raised from 35 to 40 years. However, it proved difficult to interest able persons newly launched on other careers in becoming specialists on particular world areas. Of the 26 postdoctoral fellowships awarded, all but a few went to persons who had a prior interest in the study of a particular area.

Although the committee had announced that applications for work in closely related fields of the natural sciences and humanities could be considered, as is shown in Table 1, the great majority of awards were for research in those disciplines usually included in the social sciences. No appointment was made for research in natural science; however, 13 awards were made to scholars in the humanities, all of the latter being specialists in linguistics or in the languages and literatures of various areas. As might be expected in a program devoted to research and training on the contemporary cultures of world areas, more awards went to anthropologists than to representatives of any other one discipline.

TABLE 1
ACADEMIC FIELDS OF FELLOWS AND GRANTEES

Field	Total fellowships and grants	Grantees	Fellows
All fields	216*	63†	153
Anthropology	67	19	48
History	42	12	30
Political science and international relations	41	10	31
Economics	20	4	16
Geography	17	8	9
Sociology	11	4	7
Languages and literature	10	3	7
Regional studies	4	..	4
Linguistics	3	2	1
Law	1	1	..

* Only persons who have taken up their awards are included in this total. Two persons have held both fellowships and travel grants and are tabulated in both groups.

† One person has held two travel grants, but is tabulated once.

About 75 percent of the fellowships and grants in the social sciences were for work in those fields that in this country have traditionally been concerned with foreign

areas, namely anthropology, geography, history, and political science. Relatively few awards were for research in fields, such as economics and sociology, that have emphasized the study of Western, and particularly American, society and institutions. It is especially notable that not a single award was made for work in psychology, although some have interpreted this merely as evidence of the independent status of that discipline as a generalizing science.

AREAS OF STUDY

When the program was inaugurated, firsthand field experience in the areas of interest was viewed as essential to high-level training. But the hope that the Soviet Union, then virtually closed to scholars from Western countries, would presently reopen its gates was doomed to disappointment, and as time went on China and many nations of Central Europe successively closed their doors. Of the 20 recipients of awards for research on China, for example, only five gained entry to that country, and their freedom of movement and inquiry was severely curtailed by events of the civil war. Others who had been offered awards for field work in China had to abandon their plans, and since 1950 persons specializing on China have been obliged to continue their studies either in the United States or in such places as Hong Kong, Formosa, and Japan. Nor have all non-Communist nations extended a ready welcome to foreign scholars; some of them have preferred to keep their domestic problems to themselves and have been prone to regard research as espionage.

It thus early became necessary to choose between abandoning efforts to study certain areas and learning as much as possible about them either in the United States or in other accessible countries. Many students of Slavic areas, for example, have found resources that are not available here still open to them in Western Europe. Of the entire group of 153 area research training fellows, 103 actually carried on studies in the area of their primary interest; 14 worked in other foreign countries; and the work of 36 was confined wholly to the United States.

Japan, on the other hand, was reopened to American scholars after being closed to persons not officially connected with the occupation forces for a number of years following the cessation of hostilities. Since 1950 when the first Council fellow received official permission to enter Japan, an increasing number of fellows and grantees have done field work in that country.

With the exception of a few programs designed to give the fellows training in the languages and cultures of specific areas preparatory to actual field work, fellows were required wherever possible to work in the area

being studied, and to spend a major portion of their fellowship terms in the field. Tables 2 and 3 show the geographical distribution of areas of study for both grantees and fellows, and the extent to which the latter were debarred from visiting certain areas. Since travel grants were intended to defray the costs of travel to and in the areas of interest, the recipients of these awards could not use them for study in the United States. However, four holders of travel grants did use them for research on the areas of their interest in countries other than those with which they were primarily concerned.

TABLE 2
AREAS OF STUDY: FELLOWS AND GRANTEES

Area	Total fellowships and grants	Grantees	Fellows
All areas	216	63	153
Eastern Europe and U.S.S.R.	37	2	35
Latin America and Caribbean	31	11	20
Japan and the Philippines	29	8	21
Western Europe	28	18	10
China, incl. Mongolia	22	5	17
Africa	19	3	16
Southeast Asia, incl.			
Australia and Pacific Islands	19	7	12
India and Pakistan	17	4	13
Near and Middle East, incl.			
North Africa	14	5	9

TABLE 3
PLACES AND AREAS OF STUDY: FELLOWS ONLY

Area	Total number of fellows	Number of fellows working in		
		Area of interest	Other foreign countries	United States only
All areas	153	103	14	36
Eastern Europe and U.S.S.R.	35	2*	9	24
Japan and the Philippines	21	21
Latin America and Caribbean	20	20
China, incl. Mongolia †	17	3	4	10
Africa	16	16
India and Pakistan	13	12	..	1
Southeast Asia	12	11	1	..
Western Europe	10	10
Near and Middle East	9	8	..	1

* Includes one fellow who worked in Czechoslovakia and one in Yugoslavia.

† Two fellows specialized on Mongolia and Inner Asia.

From inspection of these tables it may be noted that the only area in which the number of grantees exceeded that of fellows was Western Europe where the ratio was almost two to one. With the exception of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, which are heavily represented, the various world areas, whether remote or near at hand, well known or unfamiliar, were fairly evenly represented

in fellows' studies. While several reasons may be adduced to explain these facts, they apparently do reflect a growing interest on the part of younger persons in those areas that had been relatively neglected in the past.

At no time was the committee guided by a quota system for various world areas in making its selections. The only criteria were the student's apparent qualifications to undertake the research proposed in his application. It is true, however, that the availability of other awards such as Fulbright scholarships and those offered by various foundations for work in certain countries lessened the demand for Council fellowships for particular areas.

GRADUATE TRAINING OF AREA FELLOWS

During the first two years of the program the majority of fellows and grantees were not affiliated with area centers or institutes, but with each successive year an increasing number of the students and staffs of these centers were the recipients of fellowships and grants. In 1951-52, the last year that the program was in full operation, more than two thirds of the appointees were associated with area centers or universities offering programs of area studies. Thus, in actual operation as well as in its conception the fellowship program was an important adjunct to the formal training available in centers of

on Africa, China, Eastern Europe and Russia, India and Pakistan, Japan, and Southeast Asia had received training in organized centers or programs of area study before beginning tenure of their fellowships, while most fellows specializing on Latin America, the Middle East, and Western Europe had not worked under such auspices.

In addition to the formal training received at their own universities, many fellows undertook further special training, primarily in the languages of their areas, and consulted at length with acknowledged experts on their areas either in this country or abroad. In some cases such training was accomplished before beginning the fellowship; in others it was regarded as an integral part of the fellowship program of the individual. Thus, the majority of persons specializing on Africa spent periods ranging from a few weeks to several months in England, where unique resources for research and consultation relating to Africa are available, before undertaking research in the field.

Most discussions of area research and training have stressed its interdisciplinary nature,² and the staffs of area centers are often drawn from a variety of social science and humanistic fields. Nevertheless, comparatively few of the appointees have done their field work as members of interdisciplinary research teams. The great majority of area fellows and grantees have carried on

TABLE 4
GRADUATE AREA TRAINING OF FELLOWS

	Total, all areas		Number of fellows								
	Number	Percent	Africa	China, Mongolia	Eastern Europe, U.S.S.R.	India, Pakistan	Japan, Philippines	Latin America, Caribbean	Near & Middle East	Southeast Asia, Australia, Islands	Western Europe
Total	153	100	16	17	35	13	21	20	9	12	10
Students in integrated area programs	88	58	9	14	28	5	18	3	2	8	1
Students in universities offering other special area work	12	8	1	2	..	2	..	6	..	1	..
Students in universities offering no special area work	47	31	6	1	4	5	1	11	7	3	9
Fellows associated with area centers while on fellowship	6	4	3	1	2

area instruction. The types of programs and institutions in which the 153 area fellows received their training are indicated in Table 4. The classification of area centers follows that given in *Area Studies in American Universities*, by Wendell C. Bennett (published by the Council in June 1951). The table reflects the relative development of area study programs for the major world areas represented. A majority of the fellows specializing

their research as individuals or in collaboration with husband or wife. It is true, however, that many of the

² See, for example, Robert B. Hall, *Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences*, Social Science Research Council Pamphlet 3 (1947); Charles Wagley, *Area Research and Training: A Conference Report on the Study of World Areas*, Social Science Research Council Pamphlet 6 (1948); and Julian H. Steward, *Area Research: Theory and Practice*, Social Science Research Council Bulletin 63 (1950).

individual research projects were designed to complement or to be a part of long-range research planned by an area center.

PRESENT ACTIVITIES OF AREA FELLOWS

Most of the area fellows are still at early stages in their careers, but it is evident from Table 5 that the majority are destined for academic careers.

mittee on Area and Language Specialists, jointly made a survey of the placement of graduates and former students of 23 university area centers during the period June 1946–February 1953. Table 6 compares the results of this survey with data on the employment of Council area fellows.

Since a large majority of the graduates of university area centers included in Table 6 are at the M.A. rather

TABLE 5
ACTIVITIES OF AREA FELLOWS, JUNE 1953

	Total	Fellows employed in			Fellows studying		
		Academic field	Government	Foundations and private organizations	On SSRC or other fellowship	Other advanced work	Other *
Total, all areas							
Number	153	69	12	7	50	10	5
Percent of all fellows	100	45	8	5	33	7	3
Area							
Africa	16	4	11	1	..
China, Mongolia	17	9	1	..	5	..	2
Eastern Europe, U.S.S.R.	35	16	5	4	9	..	1
India, Pakistan	13	2	10	..	1
Japan, Philippines	21	12	..	2	3	4	..
Latin America, Caribbean	20	10	3	..	4	2	1
Near & Middle East	9	2	2	..	4	1	..
Southeast Asia, Australia, Pacific Islands	12	5	1	1	4	1	..
Western Europe	10	9	1	..

* Includes 1 on military duty, 2 in nonprofessional occupations, 1 interned in China, and 1 unknown.

That so many former fellows occupy academic posts may be taken as one measure of the success of the program, for its explicit purpose was to train persons who would assume leading roles both in training others and in advancing basic research on world areas. Not all fellows academically employed are well situated to engage directly in widening the circles of Americans who are becoming familiar with particular foreign areas. But even the fellows with less immediate opportunity to teach intensively about their areas of special interest are better able as a result of their own area training to impart to their students and to others some comprehension of the common and the diverse elements in the world's major cultural patterns. Similarly, those employed in government service and other professional occupations were not narrowly trained in the minimum skills required for predetermined tasks, and it can be hoped that their broadened outlooks and deepened insights into other cultural heritages will be advantageous in their present assignments.

In the winter of 1952–53 the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies, at the request of a governmental Special Survey Com-

mittee on Area and Language Specialists, jointly made a survey of the placement of graduates and former students of 23 university area centers during the period June 1946–February 1953. Table 6 compares the results of this survey with data on the employment of Council area fellows. Nevertheless, the differences in the proportions of the two groups in academic and government positions are striking, especially since the number

TABLE 6
PERCENT DISTRIBUTIONS OF EMPLOYED SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL AREA FELLOWS AND FORMER STUDENTS OF 23 UNIVERSITY AREA STUDY CENTERS

	Fellows	Area center students
Percent of total employed	100	100
Academic positions	78	30
Government	14	50*
Foundations and other private organizations	8	8
Business, industry, law, journalism	0	12
Number presently employed	88	443

* Including United Nations, other international agencies, and foreign governments.

of area center graduates in academic employment include some who have also been Social Science Research Coun-

cil area fellows. It is also noteworthy that while 12 percent of the area center graduates are employed in business or industry or in a profession such as journalism, no area fellow of the Council is so employed. Although a superficial comparison of the employment patterns of the two groups suggests a detachment of former area fellows from the critical issues of the day, it may be pointed out that their role in training others whose principal preoccupations are with these very problems is of real importance.

OTHER SUPPORT FOR AREA STUDIES

In the six years since the Social Science Research Council program of area research training fellowships and travel grants was launched, the opportunities for study and research abroad have increased manyfold. Fulbright awards have become available for study and research by both graduate students and advanced scholars in numerous foreign countries. Since 1952 the Ford Foundation, through its Board on Overseas Training and Research, has offered fellowships for work in the Near and Middle East and Asia, and it has recently announced offerings in the Slavic field. Although these nationwide programs and others of longer standing, such as the Doherty Foundation fellowships for Latin America and the fellowships of the American-Scandinavian Foundation, are restricted to certain countries and are designed for a broader range of purposes, many potential applicants for Social Science Research Council area fellowships may look to them for support. There are of course

many other sources of support for work abroad, but the Council's program was unique in having as its central purpose the advancement of high-level social science training and research on foreign areas throughout the world.

Termination of the area program with the exhaustion of the available funds does not mean that the Council will no longer offer support to individuals for area research and training. As in the years preceding the establishment of these special offerings, the Council's regular research training fellowships and grants-in-aid of research will be open to many persons wishing to study or carry on research in foreign countries. The consequent greater demand which may realistically be anticipated for the latter two types of award will mean of course that a relatively smaller proportion of applications can be supported.

This report would be incomplete without an expression of appreciation, from the staff members who have been in a position to observe the large burden of work involved, for the voluntary services of the 16 scholars who served at various times on the Committee on Area Research Training Fellowships. Credit for whatever contribution the program has made to the advancement of scientific knowledge must go in large measure to them: C. E. Black, W. Rex Crawford, Cora Du Bois, Fred Eggan, Merle Fainsod, Robert B. Hall, Richard Hartshorne, Melville J. Herskovits, Philip E. Mosely, Roy F. Nichols, Thorsten Sellin, Lauriston Sharp, Robert S. Smith, Charles Wagley, Henry C. Wallich, and the late Walter L. Wright, Jr.

THE CONFERENCE ON PROBLEMS OF AREA RESEARCH IN CONTEMPORARY AFRICA

by Bryce Wood

IN THE years since the end of World War II, American students in the social sciences and other disciplines have taken an increased interest in African problems. Attention was drawn to Africa during the war by the battles fought in the north, along the Mediterranean shore, and by the establishment of transportation lines farther south, through French West Africa and the Sudan. Following the war, the emergence of the Belgian Congo as a principal producer of uranium, and the growing realization of the contemporary and potential significance of racial and nationalist movements in Africa have kept the affairs of that continent nearer the center of world interest than in the interwar period.

Although African studies in American universities have grown more slowly than studies of certain other areas, a substantial number of graduate students, mostly anthropologists, have recently engaged in field work in East and West Africa; and "scholarly safaris" have given opportunities to groups of social scientists to obtain brief firsthand views of African conditions, and perhaps to develop sustained research interests in them.

In recognition of these developments, a conference at Princeton University on October 14-16, 1953 was sponsored jointly by the National Research Council and the Social Science Research Council with the aid of a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The theme

chosen for the conference was: "Stability and Change in African Society." The geographical focus of the conference was Middle Africa, the area south of the Sahara and north of the Union of South Africa. Among the 68 participants from universities, foundations, government agencies, and other institutions were six representatives from abroad: Miss Audrey Richards, East African Institute of Social and Economic Research (Kampala, Uganda); Miss Peter Ady, St. Anne's College, Oxford University; H. R. Burrows, University of Natal; Paul M. Henry, Commission for Technical Cooperation in Africa South of the Sahara (London); Jacques Maquet, Central African Institute of Scientific Research (IRSAC), Astrida, Belgian Congo; Kenneth Robinson, Nuffield College, Oxford University.

Within the general theme, discussion was centered on factors of stability and change in political, religious, and economic and social institutions. Papers were distributed in advance of the meeting and the conference sessions were given over to discussion of questions raised by the papers, which were written by younger scholars who had recently engaged in field research in Africa.¹

In addition to the discussion of substantive questions, the members of the conference gave extensive consideration to the special problems of field research in Middle Africa, and to the development of African studies in the United States. The present report is primarily concerned with these latter subjects.

AN APPROACH TO AFRICAN STUDIES

Emphasis was given to the view that Americans, specialists as well as members of the general public, should examine afresh some of their stock assumptions in trying to understand political and social problems in African colonial territories. Because the United States broke its colonial bonds as the result of a revolutionary struggle, a tendency to sympathize with the peoples of colonial territories rather than with the governments of metropolitan powers has persisted in this country to the present day. It was suggested that this tendency, though unexceptionable in itself, has occasionally been expressed without adequate consideration of the factors in a complex relationship. There may have been a certain inevitable character, according to this view, about the surge of European expansion that created colonial administrations in Middle Africa. How-

ever, there were possible and feasible directions for the future evolution of those administrations other than toward political independence for the local population. It was pointed out that Americans have recently become aware that they might be pulled in more than one direction in consequence of conflicts between their sympathies and their strategic interests. Relatively few existing colonial territories have had the advantage, possessed by the American colonies in 1776, of a citizenry sufficiently experienced, educated, and varied in skills to maintain a new nation in its independence. At present the liberal West does not offer the only model by which newly independent peoples might fashion their societies; and people in the United States, now participating more actively than ever before in world politics, might give consideration to colonial problems with a view to trying to lead African peoples into enduring cooperation with the West. It may be too late for this, as racial and political conflicts are already serious and even violent, but there may still be time to bring it about. The hope was expressed that the development in the United States of greater understanding of African problems might contribute to this end.

The expression of these views initiated discussion of a problem facing scholars in this and other areas. To the question of what role should be played by American students of African problems, one answer was that their only interest should be in science and scholarship; the solution of practical problems is not the business of Americans, but that of the people intimately concerned in the situation. American students in Africa should consider themselves as guests, who might be able to contribute to the understanding of basic problems and to advance the frontiers of knowledge. It was also proposed, however, that Americans should not abstain from the study of policy problems having practical value to governmental agencies or business concerns. Research done in an unbiased and conscientious way might well be devoted to certain problems deemed more urgent than others in political or economic priority scales. Another phase of this discussion led to the observation that some research is both "basic" and "practical" since, for example, kinship studies may contribute to better understanding of the social structure as a whole and hence throw light on such problems as the recruitment of labor.

It was recognized that there is no easy answer to these questions. While it was not felt that research should be directed to purposes of administrators, there remained some difference of opinion between those who supported the undertaking of any "basic" research of a scientific character, which "must underlie any practical approach to a solution," and those who felt that "time was run-

¹ Papers were prepared by: James B. Christensen, Wayne University; James S. Coleman, University of California at Los Angeles; John H. Dean, Hunter College; Lloyd A. Fallers, Princeton University; Charles E. Fuller, University of Missouri; Robert F. Gray, University of Chicago; Robert A. Lystad, Tulane University; Daniel F. McCall, Columbia University; John C. Messenger, Michigan State College; Simon Ottenberg, Northwestern University; William B. Schwab, Haverford College; Donald Simmons, Yale University.

ning out in Africa" and that certain subjects of research, such as land use and food production, should therefore receive major attention.

It was further recognized that the choice of research topics would be made by individuals in terms of their own interests and judgments about the significance of their work. There was no disposition to recommend that all research proposals should be evaluated in terms of their immediate relevance to issues of public welfare, since there is always "a place for persons without interest in economic and social development," and for those with "a monastic concentration on the unreal." Differently motivated and diversely oriented people would continue to engage in varied lines of research; some would define an "area," such as Africa, as "a place where problems are studied," while others would regard it as a place where the problems that are more pressing than others should be solved first. These two points of view were not mutually exclusive, but they were sufficiently distinct so that they had different operational implications. For example, the adoption of the first view would result in relatively little concern about the making of "research efforts"; it would also permit taking the position that some questions, such as that concerning the number of people who should study, would solve themselves. At this and other points, issues concerning approaches to and the substance of research became interwoven with considerations of method.

RESEARCH METHODS

Most of the conference papers were written by anthropologists. Some of the questions of method arising from the papers were therefore directed at the techniques used by anthropologists. However, the greater part of such questions would have been no less applicable to work in other disciplines if their students had been equally enterprising in pioneering in field studies in Africa. Where unexamined social problems are so vast in comparison to accomplished research, inadequacies of research are multidisciplinary in character.

In general terms, encouragement was given to making more refined analyses of the processes of social and cultural change, to undertaking more systematic and extensive research on interrelationships among cultures, and to comparison of the effects of different administrative policies on local peoples of similar culture. The development of greater self-consciousness in working out conceptual formulations and research methods was stressed. Interest was expressed, in this connection, in the use of combinations of sociological and anthropological techniques in research on the growth of urbanism, as reported in one of the papers.

More specifically, economists expressed the hope that anthropological studies might in future provide more kinds of information that they could use. For example, information about lineage is not enough for their purposes. How does money flow in African communities? What is the composition of family budgets? Those interested in expanding the supply of labor for types of production that might enable Middle Africa to participate to a greater degree in the world economy would like to know more about problems of recruitment and training.

The communication of research results to specialists and nonspecialists was considered to be of general interest, and to involve several kinds of questions. It was suggested that ways might be found to carry out research that might provide information and analyses of broad significance. While it was recognized that data are of fundamental importance, it was felt that social scientists have a responsibility to go beyond the limits of purely descriptive studies, and to try to establish relationships of cause and effect. In this way, it was remarked, the growth and refinement of theory would be speeded, the relevance of research to policy decisions would be made more direct, and the value of studies in one discipline for those in another would be enhanced.

The transmission of research products to social scientists and the general public was held to be impeded by types of research reports that are obstructive of understanding on the part of nonspecialists. A plea was made for writing reports in a style that avoids excessive use of words in African languages, and that employs a minimum of disciplinary "jargon." It was also urged that attempts be made to establish some precision of meaning for words having specialized connotations in Middle Africa. As one example it was pointed out that the word "hospital," if used to describe an institution in Middle Africa, would be unlikely to give Americans an adequate picture of the medical facilities available.

ORGANIZATION OF RESEARCH

Consideration of the suggestion that "a design for African studies" should be prepared by American and other social scientists brought forth varied comment. In one direction, strong defense was offered for the work of lone research workers. It was remarked that the tradition of individual investigations was perhaps stronger in Great Britain than in the United States, and the explanation was hazarded by one of the visitors from Great Britain that this might be because American scholars have "rather pleasanter characteristics" than British scholars. In this connection an American student remarked that on landing in East Africa he had

felt like a "sheep in lone wolf's clothing," and that he had found collaboration with other scholars of essential value in carrying out his research. Another American admitted a feeling of "intimidation" on realizing that the problems he faced in research in West Africa could not be explained in terms of his own disciplinary training. He suggested that there is need to establish a hierarchy of problems, and then to attempt to find solutions through a system of techniques involving one or more disciplines. Some theories about problems might be developed through interdisciplinary collaboration; multidisciplinary activity was suggested as particularly appropriate for dealing with problems of method. It was hoped that through cooperative activity on many fronts, related studies in Middle Africa might be undertaken not with a sense of intimidation, but with a sense of breaking new ground.

Up to the present, American scholars have engaged in relatively little team research in Middle Africa. The conference participants who felt that an attempt should be made to create a "research structure" were especially interested in the promotion of team research of various kinds. Among possible types are: (1) "linked" projects in which students make investigations distinct in themselves and carried on in different places, but in which various degrees of cooperation might be arranged; (2) teamwork on specific problems by scholars of one discipline; (3) joint projects, involving representatives of several disciplines, for the study of specific problems; (4) interdisciplinary area studies.

It was suggested that junior scholars are less suited for team research than mature scholars, partly because of their greater defensiveness about disciplinary lines. One informed view was that joint or team research represents a sort of summit, which may be attained by research workers at a time considerably later than the "lone wolf" stage.

In view of the fact that in several colonial territories in Middle Africa there are research institutes of an official or semi-official character, and in view of some special features of research in a colonial situation, there was deep interest in ways and means of organizing effective research relationships between American students and European students in the metropolitan countries and in Middle Africa. Discussion of this subject arose from a query as to whether a welcome might be anticipated in Africa for American research aimed not at interference with colonial administrations, but at furthering an understanding of the present scene.

Several answers to this question were given. In general, it appeared that individual American scholars would be received as in the past, with traditional African courtesy. However, the warmth of their welcome would

be greater if certain changes could be made in the existing situation.

It was pointed out that American scholars are not always distinguished, by colonial administrators, from "the endless stream" of American experts visiting Africa on technical assistance or mutual security missions. It was noted that the problem of getting expert advice accepted by administrators is world-wide, and when the advice comes from foreigners, the difficulties of the problem are multiplied. There is a probably unavoidable initial element of suspicion in the attitude of administrators toward foreigners engaged in research. There are various ways or combinations of ways in which this attitude might be overcome. If the student, instead of being a short-term visitor, could stay long enough in one territory to become a part of the local scene, and if he possessed qualities permitting him to gain the confidence both of administrators and the local population, his research would evoke cooperation. In French and Belgian areas, the welcome to American research scholars who do not speak French cannot be expected to equal that in territories where English is the language of the administration. Finally, it was noted that efforts have been made in Belgium, France, and Great Britain to develop some degree of coordination in research, and it was suggested that the discovery of some means of organizing, without controlling, American scholars going to Middle Africa would reduce certain existing difficulties.

The forms that such organization might take were outlined in some detail. It was regarded as essential that care be taken to obtain introductions to appropriate administrative officials so that the type of research planned could be explained to them before its initiation. Field research in the social sciences might be very difficult if not impossible if officials were hostile to the proposed investigations. Introductions that would facilitate research might be obtained through existing research institutes in Middle Africa, and an approach by way of the institutes would give governments some assurance that the individuals concerned were responsible social scientists.

Americans desiring affiliation with research institutions in Middle Africa would be accorded the fullest cooperation if they could arrive in Africa with greater resources and more time to spend than has been customarily possible. They should, for example, be so financed that they could provide their own automobiles. In addition, they should plan to stay in Africa for not less than two years; housing facilities are so limited in Kampala, for example, that it is difficult to find room on short notice for students who expect to spend brief periods in Uganda. On the other hand, Americans able

to fulfill these conditions would be warmly welcomed, particularly if they were willing to work on "linked" research projects. For example, one on leadership in East African society was so organized that Americans could readily find a place if they were willing to work under the same conditions, and on the same salary scales, as their colleagues.

One way for Americans to give greater depth and utility to their research work, it was pointed out, is through adequate study of documentary sources before beginning field work. It was suggested that little advance in research could be expected from rather extensive studies of political institutions in West Africa, done in a short period of time, and preceded by insufficient study of official and other sources of information

available in the metropolitan countries. The observation was made by a visiting scholar that a major American contribution to studies of Middle Africa in the social sciences would be the organization in the United States of an effective center of documentation on African problems.

Observations of this kind and the interest of a number of participants in the conference in the development of future research in Africa were responsible for consideration by the conference at its closing session of methods of furthering research and making mutually advantageous arrangements between American scholars and institutions, and research organizations abroad which are already engaged in coordinated and interdisciplinary research on African problems.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

H. B. James (chairman), Lee R. Martin (secretary), R. G. Bressler, Jr., J. K. Galbraith, Earl O. Heady, D. Gale Johnson, Glenn L. Johnson, William H. Nicholls, Kenneth H. Parsons, Frederick V. Waugh.

Plans regarding the content and development of a handbook on research techniques were formulated by the committee during its meeting at North Carolina State College on November 5-6. If sufficient support can be obtained for this project, the handbook will examine the specific uses and limitations of a wide variety of empirical techniques in their applications to particular bodies of data and particular types of research problems, with an introductory discussion of the present state of agricultural economics research. Techniques now in common use will be critically re-examined and various newer techniques will be treated at greater length. It is expected that this task will require a substantial part of the time of three or four advanced research workers during a period of perhaps two years and the collaboration of a considerable number of other experts. The plans approved by the committee are based upon recommendations from its Subcommittee on Handbooks of Research Techniques, which consists of Earl O. Heady (chairman), R. L. Anderson, Clifford Hildreth, and Herman Southworth, who has succeeded Frederick V. Waugh as a member of the subcommittee. The subcommittee's recommendations were developed after correspondence with agricultural economists at most of the leading colleges or experiment stations in the United States. Possible steps to broaden the content of the handbook to make it generally useful to economists in fields other than agriculture are being initiated through discussions with the Research Committee of the American Economic Association.

Drafts of portions of a report that is being prepared by the Subcommittee on Appraisal and Planning of Research were also considered at the November meeting. In accord-

ance with plans approved by the committee the subcommittee hopes by February to have completed a review of research on the factors leading to the persistence within the United States of rural areas characterized by low family incomes and low agricultural productivity. The report will include a general statement of the problem, an analysis of research recently completed or under way, and the subcommittee's recommendations regarding future research. The several sections of the document are being prepared by the members of the subcommittee: D. Gale Johnson who has succeeded William H. Nicholls as chairman of the subcommittee, J. K. Galbraith, William E. Hendrix who has recently been appointed a member of the subcommittee, Mr. Nicholls, and Kenneth H. Parsons.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Simon Kuznets (chairman), Shepard B. Clough, Richard Hartshorne, Edgar M. Hoover, Wilbert E. Moore, Morris E. Opler, Joseph J. Spengler.

As an important part of its program of experimental projects to stimulate wider interest and participation in research on problems of economic growth the committee is providing modest financial assistance for several studies by European scholars. Arrangements have been concluded for an evaluation of the long-term statistical series relating to the national income and its components in the United Kingdom, to be undertaken by Phyllis Deane under the auspices of the Department of Applied Economics at the University of Cambridge, and for a review and revision of existing statistical data relating to the national income and its components in Sweden during the period 1861-1930, by Olof Lindahl under the auspices of the Konjunkturinstitutet at Stockholm. Negotiations are under way for other studies in Germany, Italy, and Norway.

The committee's collaboration with the International Association for Research in Income and Wealth resulted in

the preparation for the Association's 1953 conference in Italy of papers relating to Canada, Denmark, England, France, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, and Norway; most of these are to be published by the Association in 1954. Further sessions on economic growth are to be held at the Association's 1955 conference in Denmark, at which there will be presented papers embodying the results of the several projects sponsored by the committee in European countries, as well as of research that is being initiated in Australia, and a summary paper by the chairman of the committee. Plans have been completed for four small conferences to be held between April and November 1954 on selected factors influencing economic growth. The committee is also collaborating with the Population Division of the United Nations in organizing a special conference at which the prospective publication of the United Nations on "Determinants and Consequences of Population Trends" will be reviewed critically and a plan for future needed research will be formulated.

LABOR MARKET RESEARCH

Dale Yoder (chairman), E. Wight Bakke, Philip M. Hauser, Clark Kerr, Charles A. Myers, Gladys L. Palmer, Carroll L. Shartle.

The committee is undertaking two further critical evaluations of research in the labor field; one is designed to appraise research during the past decade on human relations within industrial plants and other business enterprises, and the other will review the recent major efforts to study union-management relationships. Papers on the first of these are being prepared by Chris Argyris of Yale University and Robert Tannenbaum of the University of California at Los Angeles, while Robert Dubin of the University of Illinois and John G. Turnbull of the University of Minnesota are preparing topics dealing with the second area. These papers will constitute the basic materials for a research conference to be held in the spring. In addition, John R. Coleman of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology is exploring for the committee possible ways of defining more sharply research on the operation of trade unions at the local level.

The final report on the committee's survey of labor mobility in six cities has been completed at the University of Pennsylvania by Gladys L. Palmer with the assistance of Carol P. Brainerd, and is scheduled for early publication by the Council as "Labor Mobility in Six Cities." An independent appraisal of recent research in the mobility field undertaken for the committee by Herbert S. Parnes of Ohio State University is virtually completed and also scheduled for publication in the near future, under the title "Research in Labor Mobility: An Appraisal of Research Findings in the United States." A third volume of papers by E. Wight Bakke, Philip M. Hauser, Clark Kerr, Charles A. Myers, Gladys L. Palmer, and Lloyd G. Reynolds, summarizing findings of research relating to labor mobility on which they and their colleagues have been engaged, is being published by the Technology Press.

POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

David B. Truman (chairman), Conrad M. Arensberg, Angus Campbell, Alfred de Grazia, Oliver Garceau, V. O. Key, Avery Leiserson, M. Brewster Smith.

Last spring the committee planned to experiment in 1953-54 with a flexible program to clarify approaches and focal problems in the study of political process and behavior. Underlying the plan were the committee's assumptions that "political behavior" is not properly a subfield within political science but an approach that is relevant to most if not all of the problems within the conventional scope of the discipline, and that attention to particular substantive problems is more likely to bear fruit than abstract methodological discussion. The committee decided to encourage advances in a number of problem areas through critical examination of their present status and attempts to formulate next steps. James C. Davies of the California Institute of Technology was invited to prepare for the committee a working paper on research on political participation, appraising accomplishments up to the present time, examining implicit and explicit assumptions underlying research, and offering constructive suggestions as to further work. A preliminary version of his paper was discussed at a meeting of the committee on November 7-8.

A second research area to be examined in similar fashion is the comparative study of political process in countries outside the Western democratic legal tradition. Lucian Pye of Princeton University is preparing a memorandum to serve as a basis for discussion at a small conference to be held under the auspices of the committee in December. The committee also plans to devote sessions in the winter and spring of 1954 to research in state and local political contexts.

The committee has continued to review progress on the study of the 1952 presidential election undertaken by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center with the sponsorship of the committee and support from a grant to the Council by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The draft of a book reporting on the principal results of the research is nearly completed, and is expected to go to press at the end of 1953. More detailed technical analyses of selected aspects of the data are being prepared for publication in journals.

SOCIAL BEHAVIOR: SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILD DEVELOPMENT

John W. M. Whiting (chairman), David F. Aberle, Alfred L. Baldwin, William E. Henry, Robert R. Sears; *staff*, M. Brewster Smith.

At a meeting on October 31-November 1, the subcommittee reviewed the progress of the pilot projects in the cross-cultural study of child rearing that are being conducted at several universities with support from a grant to the Council by the Ford Foundation. Under the direction of John W. M. Whiting at Harvard University, Irvin L. Child at Yale University, and William Lambert at Cornell University, prospective field teams are undergoing train-

ing and are preparing detailed plans for field work in three cultures during 1954-55. The field studies are being designed to experiment with procedures recommended in the preliminary draft of the "Field Manual for the Cross-Cultural Study of Child Rearing," prepared for the subcommittee by John W. M. Whiting and others and made available in mimeographed form in February. Collection of data on individual differences in selected aspects of child training and in various measures of child and adult behavior in the three cultures, moreover, is intended to test, in varying cultural contexts, hypotheses concerning child training and personality development arising in part from studies in our own culture.

The three teams are as follows: Kim and Romaine Romney, Harvard; William and Cora Nydegger, Cornell; and Thomas and Hatsumi Suga Maretzski, Yale. These teams will meet with the principal investigators and consultants in the summer of 1954 to complete their plans for the collection of comparable data on selected transcultural variables.

The subcommittee took note of the large number of thoughtful responses that had resulted from its request for critical comment on the preliminary draft of the "Field Manual." The revision of the manual was viewed by the subcommittee as its principal task, once field work in the pilot projects is fully launched. The purpose of a revised and enlarged manual would be to facilitate more adequate cross-cultural research on child development. In addition to eliminating various inadequacies in the preliminary version, the subcommittee is interested in extending the scope of the manual in two directions: to include (1) the relationship between child-rearing practices and the requirements of social systems, and (2) other personality and training variables than those to which focal attention had been given thus far. Emphasis throughout would be given to the identification and operational definition of transcultural variables. Members of the subcommittee agreed to prepare working memoranda on some of these matters for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENT

MODIFIED DEADLINE FOR UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH STIPEND APPLICATIONS

As previously announced all applications for fellowships and grants will be due in the Washington office of the Council, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., not later than January 4, 1954. Candidates for Undergraduate Research Stipends and their sponsors will be expected to file formal preliminary applications on or before January 4, but will be permitted to postpone until February 8 submission of the detailed supplementary statements called for in the instructions for applicants. Students and faculty sponsors who are in a position to submit complete applications by January 4 are nevertheless urged to do so.

Several factors have been taken into account by the Committee on Undergraduate Research Training in recommending this modification of procedure. The committee is

aware that students in many institutions have little opportunity to become individually known to their major instructors until midway in their junior year, and that many instructors would feel more confidence in recommending students for research stipends even later in the year. Postponement of applications until later in the spring would also doubtless allow students and their sponsors to prepare more carefully their plans for the proposed summer research. However, postponement of the closing date for applications beyond early February would leave insufficient time for thorough review of applications before April 1, 1954, when awards are to be announced. The committee considered deferring announcement of awards of Undergraduate Research Stipends until later in the spring, but concluded that this would be undesirable from the standpoint of faculty supervisors who would then be obliged to hold their plans for the summer too long in abeyance.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

250 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N.Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors, 1953: RAY A. BILLINGTON, TAYLOR COLE, GORDON A. CRAIG, FRED EGGAN, CHARLES FAIRMAN, LUTHER GULICK, ROBERT B. HALL, ERNEST R. HILGARD, PENDLETON HERRING, E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, ALEXANDER H. LEIGHTON, DONALD G. MARQUIS, DOUGLAS MCGREGOR, JOHN P. MILLER, FREDERICK MOSTELLER, LOWRY NELSON, ROY F. NICHOLS, FREDERICK OSBORN, THEODORE W. SCHULTZ, ROBERT R. SEARS, MORTIMER SPIEGELMAN, GEORGE W. STOCKING, CONRAD TAEUBER, DOROTHY S. THOMAS, SCHUYLER C. WALLACE, HERBERT WECHSLER, S. S. WILKS, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, DONALD YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; M. BREWSTER SMITH; ROBERT N. WILSON; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, *Financial Secretary*

f
 r
 l
 e
 e
 l
 e
 o
 ,
 f
 -
 s
 g
 n
 e
 l
 e
 -
 -
 -
 -
 o
 e
 .
 -
 e
 ,
 -
 -
 t
 l

•